

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress  
2nd Session

Vote No. 200

July 18, 1996, 10:27 am  
Page S-8069 Temp. Record

## DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS/Final Passage

**SUBJECT:** Department of Defense Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1997 . . . S. 1894. Final passage, as amended.

**ACTION: BILL PASSED, 72-27**

**SYNOPSIS:** As passed, H.R. 3610, the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1997, will appropriate \$244.74 billion for the military functions of the Department of Defense for fiscal year (FY) 1997, which is \$10.2 billion more than requested and \$1.33 billion more than the FY 1996 funding level. Details are provided below.

- Military personnel: \$69.803 billion (an increase of \$612 million from the FY 1996 level and \$19.8 million more than requested); recommended total active duty end strength, including a total active duty end strength for the Reserves and Guards of 902,433, will be 2,359,799; a 3-percent pay raise will be provided, effective January 1, 1996; and a 4-percent increase in the basic allowance for quarters will be provided (1 percent more than requested).

- Operation and Maintenance: \$78.957 billion (a decrease of 3 percent, and \$494 million more than requested); an additional \$150 million will be transferred from the defense stockpile transaction fund; the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, which promotes the dismantlement of nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union, will be fully funded at \$328 million; a separate, \$1.1 billion account will be established to fund ongoing contingency operations; \$83 million (\$55 million less than requested) will be appropriated for Pentagon renovation activities, funding for those activities will be consolidated into one account, and total renovation funding will be capped at \$1.118 billion; \$238 million more than requested will be provided to repair deteriorating barracks; and \$49 million will be appropriated for overseas humanitarian, disaster, and civic assistance (\$31.5 million less than requested).

- Procurement: \$44.124 billion (\$5.987 billion more than requested and \$55 million more than provided in FY 1996), including: \$938 million for Army missile procurement (\$216.5 million more than requested); \$489 million for 12 F/A-18C/D fighters (the Administration did not request any of these fighters; see vote No. 197 for related debate); \$213 million for 8 F-16C/D fighters (see vote No. 199 for related debate); \$296.2 million for advance procurement of the first new attack submarine and \$701 million for advance procurement of the second new attack submarine; \$3.375 billion for 4 DDG-51 destroyers plus \$525 million for advance

(See other side)

YEAS (72)			NAYS (27)		NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (50 or 94%)	Democrats (22 or 48%)		Republicans (3 or 6%)	Democrats (24 or 52%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Hutchison	Akaka	Brown	Baucus		Bumpers <sup>-2</sup>
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Bingaman	Hatfield	Biden		
Bennett	Jeffords	Breaux	Specter	Boxer		
Bond	Kassebaum	Bryan		Bradley		
Burns	Kempthorne	Conrad		Byrd		
Campbell	Kyl	Daschle		Exon		
Chafee	Lott	Dodd		Feingold		
Coats	Lugar	Dorgan		Glenn		
Cochran	Mack	Feinstein		Graham		
Cohen	McCain	Ford		Harkin		
Coverdell	McConnell	Heflin		Kennedy		
Craig	Murkowski	Hollings		Kerrey		
D'Amato	Nickles	Inouye		Kerry		
DeWine	Pressler	Johnston		Kohl		
Domenici	Roth	Leahy		Lautenberg		
Faircloth	Santorum	Lieberman		Levin		
Frahm	Shelby	Mikulski		Moseley-Braun		<b>EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:</b>
Frist	Simpson	Murray		Moynihan		1—Official Buisiness
Gorton	Smith	Nunn		Pryor		2—Necessarily Absent
Gramm	Snowe	Pell		Rockefeller		3—Illness
Grams	Stevens	Reid		Sarbanes		4—Other
Grassley	Thomas	Robb		Simon		
Gregg	Thompson			Wellstone		<b>SYMBOLS:</b>
Hatch	Thurmond			Wyden		AY—Announced Yea
Helms	Warner					AN—Announced Nay
						PY—Paired Yea
						PN—Paired Nay

Compiled and written by the staff of the Republican Policy Committee—Larry E. Craig, Chairman

procurement; \$1.902 billion for 8 C-17 transport aircraft; and \$760 million for equipment for the Guards and Reserves.

- Research, development, test, and evaluation: \$37.434 billion (\$2.689 billion more than requested and 3 percent more than provided in FY 1996), including: full funding of \$3.39 billion for the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (\$856 million more than requested); \$808 million (\$300 million more than requested) will be provided to accelerate the development of a national missile defense system; and \$75 million will be appropriated for the Kinetic Energy Anti-Satellite (KE-ASAT) Program.

Miscellaneous:

- \$948 million will be provided for the Defense Business Operations Fund;
- \$1.1 billion will be provided for the National Defense Sealift Fund;
- \$789 million will be appropriated for drug interdiction and counterdrug activities;
- \$150 million will be provided for breast cancer research and \$100 million will be provided for prostate cancer research;
- \$150 million will be provided to implement the Weapons of Mass Destruction Act (see vote No. 195);
- a study will be conducted on defense contractor restructuring costs (see vote No. 198 for related debate);
- \$14 million will be provided for a new contingency fund, subject to its being authorized, to pay for emergency anti-terrorism activities (see vote No. 198 for related debate);
- the Guards and Reserves will submit future year defense plans to Congress;
- funding will be provided for research on Gulf War Syndrome; and
- funding will be provided to pay certain Vietnamese commandos who were interned by North Vietnam.

**Those favoring** final passage contended:

We completely support final passage. None of us, of course, is completely satisfied with every provision, but it is a solid, fair bill. In total, it will appropriate just \$1.3 billion more than last year, which will not even keep up with inflation, and procurement spending will be well below the \$60 billion that the Pentagon tells us the United States must spend yearly if it is going to be able to meet national security needs in the outyears. Many Senators would have preferred to provide at least enough funding so that in real terms we would not yet again be cutting defense. On the other side, many Senators who are supporting this bill would have preferred the \$10.2 billion in additional defense cuts that President Clinton requested. On other matters, more than 60 amendments were considered and accepted, mostly by voice vote, and most of those amendments were sponsored by Democrats. Republicans, though in the majority, have been very solicitous of Democrats' views. Another point that deserves emphasis is that this appropriations bill has not been loaded down with legislative riders. In recent years, Members of both parties have been prone to offer such riders, particularly on social issues. That impulse has been thankfully resisted on this bill. For our troops, this bill will provide a 3-percent pay raise and a 4-percent increase in the allowance for quarters. They deserve more, but we cannot afford more. A final item that merits special mention is that this bill contains a new fund to cover overseas contingencies. This fund will be used to pay the costs of unforeseen military operations. Too often, when the United States gets involved in new military conflicts, it ends up robbing operation and maintenance and other accounts to pay for them because no other funds are available. We hope that contingency funding will continue in the future. Overall, this is a very solid, "clean" appropriations bill that is within its budget allocation and that closely follows the defense authorization bill's priorities. We are confident that it will pass with strong, bipartisan support.

**Those opposing** final passage contended:

We are very disturbed that our colleagues insist on continuing to arm to the teeth against nonexistent enemies. As we have said many times in the past, we think the definition of national security needs to be broadened. A country that can repel any aggressor but is failing to meet the needs of its citizens is not secure. We need to spend more on education, infrastructure, health, and many other social concerns and stop spending so much money on defense. This bill is within its allocation, but it spends a lot more than President Clinton requested. We agree with the President--we should cut defense spending more. Therefore, we oppose final passage.